

Andrew Jackson to Nathaniel Macon, October 4, 1795, from Correspondence of Andrew Jackson. Edited by John Spencer Bassett.

TO NATHANIEL MACON.

Nashville, October 4, 1795

Sir: When in Philadelphia last April a full and Compleat state of the business I had intrusted to your patronage was handed me (by David Allison Esqr) agreeable to your instructions; wherein I viewed (with Gratitude) with what unwearied attention you had prosecuted my claim. I have now to request a Continuance of your friendly aid in bringing the business to a final End and Determination the Ensueing Session of Congress; and to Communicate to me the result of that Determination.¹

¹ Jackson had filed a claim for services as public attorney under the early territorial régime. See under date of Apr. 11, 1796, *post*.

What an alarming situation; has the late Neg[o]ciation[?] of Mr. Jay with Lord Grenvill, and that Negotiation (for a Treaty of Commerce it cannot be properly Called, as it wants reciprocity) being ratified by the Two third of the senate and president has plunged our Country in; will it End in a Civil warr; or will our Country be relieved from its present ignominy by they firmness of our representitives in Congress (by impeachments for the Daring infringments of our Constitutional rights) have the insulting Cringing and ignominious Child of aristocratic Secrecy; removed erased and obliterated from the archives of the Grand republick of the united States.

I say unconstitutional; because the Constitution says that the president by and with the advice and consent of the senate are authorise to make Treaties; but in the present Treaty

Library of Congress

the advice of the Senate was not required by the president previous to the Formation of the Treaty; nor the Out[li]ines of said Treaty made known to the Senate untill after made and their Consent wanting to make it the Supreme Law of the land (therefore made without the advice of the Senate and unconstitutional) and erecting courts not heard of in the Constitution etc. etc. all bills for reasing a revenue to originate in house of representatives by treaty. It is not only unconstitutional, but inconsistant with the Law of Nations, Vatel B2, P. 242 S325 says that the rights of Nations are benefits, of which the sovereign is only the administrator, and he ought to Dispose of them no farther than he has reason to presume that the Nation itself would dispose of them therefore the president (from the remonstrance from all parts of the Union) had reason to presume that the Nation of america would not have ratified the Treaty, notwithstand[ing] the 20 aristocratic neebobs of the Senate had Consented to it. But why should I pester you with these remarks your superior understanding can discover a thousand Defects in that Treaty that my genius are not adequate to therefore will Drop the subject. I am Sir with the highest Sentiment of Esteem and regard your most obedient